

1964

## British-Cuba Trade

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragedies of this period is the continuing deterioration of our image—as well as strength—abroad, and the contribution of Secretary of State Rusk as the administration's spokesman in this field has been less than sensational.

Columnist Max Freedman, writing in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, points out the very obvious flaws in the velled threat of Secretary Rusk over a possible U.S. shoppers' boycott of British products. The injection of this subject into the dispute with Britain over trade with Cuba is a radical, juvenile performance, and is effectively discussed in the article to which I refer:

RUSK ON BRITISH TRADE WITH CUBA—SECRETARY CALLED AT FAULT IN COMMENT ON POSSIBILITY OF A PRIVATE BOYCOTT

(By Max Freedman)

Secretary of State Rusk has come perilously close to introducing a new principle that is wicked as well as stupid. It is the principle that entire nations can be guilty of guilt by association.

On a program broadcast by the Voice of America, Mr. Rusk was asked about an American boycott of British goods because of Britain's trade with Cuba. He answered: "I think it is possible there may be some consumer reaction here in this country with respect to firms that specifically engage in that trade. But that is something that is in the hands of private citizens; we have no part in that ourselves."

Now it is most unlikely that very many Americans will have any occasion to do business with the British firm that sold the buses to Cuba—the recent item in this trade that has received the most publicity. Unless Mr. Rusk's statement is meaningless, he must be saying that a private American boycott should extend to all the firms that are trading with Cuba. How can an American consumer possibly have all this detailed information about British trade?

Mr. Rusk was not talking about a general boycott of British goods. He was talking about British firms "that specifically engage" in trade with Cuba. But there is utterly no reason why Mr. Rusk should make this distinction.

These firms are not being treated as moral lepers in England. The British people are not trying to boycott them. The British Government wants more trade with Cuba. So does the Labor Party. The British press is overwhelmingly in favor of expanded trade.

Mr. Rusk has won no praise in Britain for his supposed moderation. His reference to a boycott against particular British firms has merely bewildered people and aroused great suspicion. He stands accused of conducting a campaign against British trade for which he is unwilling to take any responsibility. Since when has Pontius Pilate come to be regarded as a model for American statesmen?

Mr. Rusk forgets that millions of Americans have personal knowledge of boycotts. In the years before the war they tried to boycott goods from Nazi Germany and Japan. The challenge from those dictator states was without precedent. By comparison, the Cuban problem is a puny affair. But Americans boycotted German and Japanese goods.

They did not boycott the goods of particular firms in other countries specifically trading with the dictators. That absurdity has been reserved for Mr. Rusk.

Despite the resentment in many countries against Nazi Germany and Japan, the boycott failed and the war came. Every boycott in recent history, whether conducted privately by consumers or proclaimed officially by Government, has failed. A boycott failed to stop Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia. The American boycott has failed to break China or Cuba. The boycott of South Africa by many Asian and African countries had been a clumsy gesture, not a fatal weapon. Israel still stands despite the Arab boycott.

That is the record of experience with boycotts. It provides no support for the belief that enough people in enough countries will support the boycott to make it prevail. The record shows, on the contrary, that there will always be someone who will break the boycott or refuse to accept it. In Cuba we know in advance that the boycott must fail. All the Communist countries will trade with Cuba, and Britain and France are hardly alone among the democratic nations in planning to increase their Cuban trade.

What makes this controversy almost grotesque is that Mr. Rusk in behaving as if the Cuban market is one of the important markets of world trade. He does not recognize that Britain objects even more to American political dictation of world trade than to any loss of sales in Cuba.

As Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk has a clear duty in the present dispute. It is his duty not to echo popular prejudices about Cuba but to fight them. He must dare to educate the American people by emphasizing unpopular truths and neglected realities. It is a duty which he has yet to fulfill.

## Support for Raising CCC Resale Price on Wheat

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I again express my belief that it is in the best interests of the Nation's farmers to raise the resale price of Government-owned surplus stocks of wheat under the Commodity Credit Corporation, from 105 percent of the support level to 115 percent. Increasing the resale level would allow the open market to operate to better advantage, since the 105-percent level tends to set a ceiling on the market. This belief is shared by the National Farm Bureau Federation and all the major farm organizations.

I believe that this point and others relating to needed grain legislation are aptly interpreted in the following radio broadcast, presented on many Midwest stations by the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.:

As the Senate Committee on Agriculture starts its work on a wheat bill, GTA is urging two important additions as part of our campaign to protect wheat farmers' income.

One such foundation would be to stop Government sales of wheat at only 5 percent above the support level, which is only 10 cents above the present loan. Just as long as there are Government wheat supplies of the class, grade, or quality the trade

wants, this selling price makes the ceiling on the market beyond which price can't go. Farmers can't redeem their loans and get any higher return. Most wheat put under loan passes into Government hands, and instead of the Government holding just the surplus, it handles a large part of each crop. In the judgment of GTA's general manager, M. W. Thatcher, and others, the ceiling ought to be at least 15 percent above the ceiling or 19 cents above the new loan. That would mean a dime more per bushel coming to producers before Government sales could be made. And it would mean that farmers could use their own co-op elevators which they have worked so hard to build.

A second important change urgently needed is for the Government to stop deducting storage charges from off-farm wheat loans. This would add another dime per bushel to the floor price for all who sold wheat early in the season. It would cost the Government little and benefit farmers much. Without this change farmers can't get the minimum support promised by law. Instead of getting 50 percent of parity, farmers will get only 50 percent less the storage deductions.

Now is the time for farmers, their cooperatives, and Main Street business supporters to let Congress know that wheat income must be saved, and that should include a higher Government ceiling price on sales, and an end to Government storage deductions from wheat loans made off farm.

Write to your Congressmen and Senators, and help them get these changes made.

## What's Wrong With L.B.J.'s Foreign Policy

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, since we appear to be fair game for every dictator in the world, Henry J. Taylor's excellent article in last Monday's Washington Daily News is well worth reading:

CRY "FROG"—AND WE JUMP

(By Henry J. Taylor)

It's a dream world.

A Castro-trained Zanzibar pigmy can put a gun at the back of our American consul and walk him to the docks. Do our ships move to protect him? Oh, no, he's just booted off to east Africa like a bag of burlap.

Three American airmen can be shot down in East Germany, and so what?

Soviet stooges can bomb the U.S. Embassy on Cyprus, surrounded by the great U.S. 6th Fleet, and photograph our Ambassador struggling in the debris and dust. The front page pictures were a sellout in Nicosia while the population watched Americans flee.

Tuppenny Ghanaian tyrant Kwame Nkrumah makes Red hay with anti-American insults, and threatened, helpless U.S. teachers are given 24 hours to get out of the country.

Congolese make a mockery of our official representation, burning our flags and tearing American passports into pieces.

Panamanian whatnots, led by more than 70 Castro-trained goons, can ambush and kill our soldiers at the Balbo High School and bomb our Embassy to boot. Our dead are quietly returned to America.

For the past 2 years, some place in the world, American embassies, consulates, or agencies have been attacked, burned, or

looted at the rate of one a month with absolute impunity. And every time even a little bottled tyrant kicks us in the teeth, to say nothing of Khrushchev or Mao, Washington hastens to say he didn't mean it.

Castro can cut off a U.S. naval base's water. We talk tough on Monday and decide on Tuesday that he doesn't mean too much trouble, after all. Meanwhile, Soviet troops can remain 90 miles off our shores 15 months after the President of the United States told the world that they must leave.

In all this, we are supposed to find a foreign policy? We are to believe a policy exists? This is not a policy; it is a catastrophe.

The result? It is not easy for a country to chop the world's leading nation down to size. But the U.S.S.R. is doing a first-class job of it.

It has been nearly 20 years since we were fully respected in the world. This came with our victory in 1945. But in vast areas the Soviet became even more respected than the United States. Yet the respect of the world is our first line of defense. This was the magic of our hallowed flag: "Don't tread on me."

Soviet policy may be a mystery to our Government but it is not a mystery to the Kremlin.

What we are seeing is the Soviet technique of gradualism. Accustom people to retreat and you cannot only push them out of firm positions (like Cuba) but they'll even begin to believe that ducking into doorways is really much better than walking down the street.

This means the aggressor is getting what he wants by having it given to him. Throughout all history that has always been the road finally to war (or surrender)—never to peace.

Our momentum down this disastrous road must be broken. Never in history have enemies won so much by so little. Never have our incredible losses in strategic positions and world authority mounted so rapidly and on all sides.

If we do not retaliate against the calculated humiliations we're suffering all over the globe, our days as the world's No. 1 power are numbered. The Soviet and its stooges cry "frog" and we jump. This must stop, or God help the United States.

### Letter on School Dropouts

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1964

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I request consent to insert in the Record a letter which I recently received from one of my constituents, Mr. Edward P. Hinman.

Eleven years ago Mr. Hinman was a high school dropout. It did not take him long to realize his mistake, but it was long enough so that he could not go back. Instead he was forced to complete his education on his own resources, a challenge to which he most proudly responded, though only with considerable effort and sacrifice.

Today Mr. Hinman holds a position befitting the college courses which he has also completed, and he has engaged in a personal drive to minimize the number of young people who will make the

same mistake that he has so long regretted.

I commend his letter to all those who are concerned with the dropout problem:

DEAR SEN: Eleven years ago I quit high school and became a dropout. I worked 3 years then joined the Navy for 4 years. Shortly after quitting school, I realized I had made the serious mistake that thousands of young people are making every day—quitting high school.

A year after quitting school, I began taking steps in the form of self-education to make up for what I had missed. During my first year in the Navy, I completed my high school education through USAFI—with honors. In addition, I completed several college courses—with distinction. Today, almost 8 years after my discharge, I have a very good position as a data processing customer engineer with IBM. My situation is not unique, but nevertheless, it was an arduous path to get where I am today.

I share your deep concern with the increasing problem of the high school dropout and what faces him when he decides to take the same road that I took. The increasing number of dropouts is placing a heavy burden on our society—our welfare agencies—and ourselves. There are very few employment opportunities awaiting them and many roads lead to dead ends. Employment requirements are becoming increasingly tougher to meet for graduates, let alone dropouts, in almost all fields of employment. Many unskilled jobs are being replaced by more efficient, labor saving, cost reducing devices such as automation, etc. My position with IBM proves this out. With the day of the computer age upon us, even everyday bookkeeping is a truly complicated, sophisticated business, which can only be accomplished by highly qualified, knowledgeable personnel. The businesses of today are forced to turn their backs on these dropouts, but why must we? I realize we don't intentionally and many communities have innovated programs to help dropouts, such as counseling, training, etc. But, why is all this necessary?

Much is being said of this problem at a local and governmental level, but what great step is being taken to help avoid this situation of over 1 million unemployed dropouts—and what safeguard is being effected to prevent its increase each year?

No one tried to stop me when I quit school and I regret that to this day. At 16 I certainly wasn't in the position to judge whether I should end my education, when I felt like it. Why are 16-year-olds allowed to do this today?

I would like the answer to the following question. If you can give it to me, Congressman. Why can't a bill be introduced to Congress that would make it compulsive for a student to complete high school? If this isn't possible on a national level, why can't it be attempted with our own State of Connecticut? I realize 16 is the legal working age in Connecticut, but it should be with stipulations, such as, not interfering with school or replacing it. Many parents don't care if their children quit school to work. If they won't stop their children—who will?

We limit the drinking age at 21 and voting at 21, yet how can we justifiably allow a young person of 16 to quit school and walk into our adult world unprepared to meet its qualifications?

Laws are made to protect the citizens and the innocent. Our young people are citizens and innocent ones at that. We should protect them and prevent these mistakes that could mar their futures for the rest of their lives.

I would certainly appreciate any comments you might have on this subject of great concern to many of us, Congressman.

EDWARD P. HINMAN, JR.

### Forty Miles of Information Every Day From Space

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, while the manned space flight program is, deservedly, the glamour part of National Aeronautics and Space Administration activities day in and day out, our unmanned satellites hurtling through space are adding new chapters to scientific knowledge. The voluminous data which are being gleaned by NASA's space science program will serve as an indispensable steppingstone to the moon—and to the stars beyond—in man's quest into the universe.

One of the best accounts I have read of the achievements of NASA's space science program was written by Lawrence Lessing for Fortune magazine of January 1964.

After graphically outlining the many significant contributions to our knowledge which have been made, and will be made, by the satellites of the Vanguard, Explorer, Mariner, OSO, IMP, Ranger, Surveyor, and other series, the article correctly points out that the crowning achievement will be getting men to the moon so astronomers with telescopes and radio and radar facilities can view the universe more directly. This is the master key to all future exploration of space.

The article concludes with the ringing declaration:

Already the new knowledge acquired in space exceeds by far the value of funds so far spent. For knowledge, more than guns and butter, is the true power of modern states.

The article follows:

FORTY MILES OF INFORMATION EVERY DAY  
FROM SPACE

(By Lawrence Lessing)

(Unmanned, and often unheralded, satellites are yielding a great fund of knowledge that is revolutionizing science's view of the universe: vast solar winds are buffeting the Van Allen Belt, cosmic dust may be affecting our weather, and the Earth turns out to be pearshaped.)

Not since Galileo poked the first optik tube at the heavens in 1609 has there been such an opening of windows on the universe as in these first years of space exploration. Today we know beyond theory or doubt that space is filled with vast interacting forces and energies, stretching down from the farthest star to Earth, and with matter in many strange, tenuous, yet palpable forms. Bringing in this new knowledge is an amazing variety of scientific satellites orbiting between 200 and 100,000 miles or more above the Earth. They range from the early grapefruit-sized Vanguards to the later, larger, drum-sized Explorers, equipped with marvels of electronic miniaturization—magnetometers, radiation counters, and the like. In addition, there are the workaday satellites, such as Tiros (for weather study), Telstar and Syncom (for communication), and various semimilitary satellites, such as Injun and Transit. Coursing closer in are the smaller sounding rockets, and farther out the long-